

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

SERAWIT GEBREKIDAN and KEVIN
JOHNSON,)
Plaintiffs,) CASE NO. C13-0508-JLR
v.)
USAA INSURANCE COMPANY,) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
et al.,)
Defendants.)

Plaintiffs Sewrawitt Gebrekidan and Kevin Johnson, proceeding *pro se*, seek to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in this civil matter. Having initially received an IFP application only from Johnson (Dkt. 1), the Court informed the parties it was unable to consider the request to proceed IFP without complete and detailed information as to the financial status of both plaintiffs. (Dkt. 2.) The Court directed plaintiffs to either pay the filing fee or submit an IFP application on behalf of plaintiff Gebrekidan demonstrating his inability to pay the filing fee.

The Court thereafter received IFP applications from both Johnson and Gebrekidan.

01 (Dkts. 3 & 4.) However, the Court remained unable to determine whether plaintiffs qualified
02 to proceed IFP. (Dkt. 6.) The Court noted that each plaintiff listed monthly expenses far
03 exceeding the amounts of money received from income and other sources, that the applications
04 did not allow for a determination as to the recipient of the money from other sources, and that
05 the information provided differed from that provided on the original application submitted by
06 Johnson. The Court again directed plaintiffs to either pay the filing fee or to submit revised
07 IFP applications on behalf of both individuals. The Court noted that, if identifying amounts of
08 money received from sources other than income, plaintiffs should clarify the recipient of that
09 money (i.e., plaintiff Johnson or plaintiff Gebrekidan), and that, if plaintiffs again maintained
10 monthly expenses exceeding the amount of income and money received from other sources,
11 they must explain how they pay for those expenses. The Court directed plaintiffs to comply
12 with its directive on or before April 24, 2013, and stated that failure to comply may result in
13 denial of the pending applications to proceed IFP and/or dismissal of this matter.

14 To date, the Court has not received amended IFP applications from plaintiffs.
15 Accordingly, the Court recommends plaintiffs' IFP applications (Dkts. 1, 3 & 4) be DENIED.
16 This action should proceed only if plaintiffs pay the applicable filing fee within **thirty (30)** days
17 after entry of the Court's Order adopting this Report and Recommendation. If no filing fee is
18 paid within thirty days of the Court's Order, the Clerk should close the file.

19 DATED this 8th day of May, 2013.



20
21 Mary Alice Theiler
22 United States Magistrate Judge